

REMARKS

This Amendment is prepared in response to Interview on November 19, 2007 (Paper No. 20071119) with SPE Ricky Ngo and Examiner Dewanda Samuel and in response to the non-final Office action mailed on 5 July 2007 (Paper No. 20070625). Claims 1 through 17 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1 through 3 and 5 through 17 by this amendment.

Prior Art Rejections

On Page 2 of Paper No. 20070625, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Shiota (US 6,987,762) in view of Yoon et al. (US 7,006,504). On Page 18 of Paper No. 20070625, the Examiner also rejected claims 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yoon et al. '504 and in view of Reeves et al. '033.

On November 19, 2007, an Interview was held between Applicant's Representative, Examiner DeWanda Samuel and SPE Ricky Ngo. An agreement was reached that if Applicant defined the term "previously-set internal channel" in independent claims 1 and 9 as being between an ingress and an egress node, and that if Applicant also defined the term "extension tag" in independent claims 1 and 9 as including an egress channel identifier and an egress forwarding engine number and if

Applicant removed repetitious language from depending claim 10, that the applied prior art rejections of Paper No. 20070625 would be overcome.

After the Interview, Applicant's representative was asked to Fax to the Examiner the claim amendments agreed upon at the Interview. Applicant did so on November 19, 2007, and the Examiner subsequently issued an Interview Summary (Paper No. 20071119) approving Applicant's Faxed claim amendments. Applicant is now filing, in Official form, these exact same claim amendments approved by the Examiner on November 19, 2007 in Paper No. 20071119 and agreed upon at the Interview on November 19, 2007. Applicant expects in return either 1) a new Office action rejecting Applicant's claims using a new combination of prior art references or 2) a Notice of Allowance upon the filing of this amendment in Official form.

Applicant is further amending FIGS. 9 and 10 of Applicant's specification by this amendment so that these drawings can be consistent with these claim amendments.

Applicant is further entering into the record why the applied prior art references of Shiota (USP 6,987,762) and Yoon (USP 7,006,504) do not fairly teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention.

1. Prior Art does not teach a Previously-Set channel within an LSR

Regarding Applicant's claim 1 and 9, Applicant claims a previously set internal channel. Applicant submits that neither Shiota nor Yoon teach or suggest this feature. Furthermore, in Paper No. 20070625, the Examiner never pointed out exactly what feature in either Shiota or Yoon corresponds to Applicant's previously-set channel. Because neither Shiota nor Yoon teach a previously set internal channel, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 is without merit.

2. Prior Art does not teach an extension tag representative of a channel leaving the LSR

Again regarding Applicant's claims 1 and 9, Applicant claims an extension tag. In Paper No. 20070625, the Examiner states that the channel handle (CH) of Yoon corresponds to Applicant's extension tag. Applicant disagrees. Applicant submits that Applicant's extension tag contains the egress channel that leads from the egress LER to a destination IP address outside the LSR. Applicant's extension tag is used for distinguishing the external VPI/VCI (see Applicant's para 0041, 0046 and FIG. 8). As a result, Applicant's extension tag is not changed anywhere within the LSR. In contradistinction, the channel handle of Yoon contains an ingress or egress channel for a particular node within an LSR. As a result, in Yoon, the value of the channel handle is changed at each node within the LSR to reflect the path coming into and leaving the present node. The channel handle of Yoon is converted within each merging unit.

Applicant submits that Applicant's extension tag is not converted as it represents a channel leading from the egress node of the LSR to a destination IP address outside of the LSR. For this reason, the channel handle of Yoon is different from Applicant's extension tag.

3. The prior art does not teach either of Applicant's two claimed tables/information bases

In Applicant's claims 1 and 9, Applicant claims 1) a forwarding information base/label information base in the forwarding engine that includes the previously set internal channel and the extension tag and 2) an extension information base/merging table in the merging unit that includes an egress channel identifier mapped to the extension tag. In Paper No. 20070625, the Examiner has not shown exactly what features of Shiota or Yoon corresponds to these features of Applicant's claims. Furthermore, neither Shiota nor Yoon fairly teach or suggest an extension tag to begin with, making a table that contains an extension tag implausible.

4. Yoon does not disclose Applicant's internal channel ID

Near the middle of Page 4 of Paper No. 20070625, the Examiner indicates that Yoon teaches Applicant's internal channel identifier of Applicant's claim 1 by saying, "In addition, Yoon et al discloses LSR receiving data having TSAR (Transmission Segmentation and Reassembly) channel identifier of the egress connection ("internal

channel identifiers”, column 6).” Applicant disagrees. Applicant submits that the internal channel ID of Applicant’s claimed invention serves to distinguish internal channels set up between the FE 306 of the ingress LER and FEs of the egress LER. The TSAR and RSAR channel identifier indicate an ingress channel and an egress channel for that one particular node within the LSR. Therefore, Applicant’s internal channel ID is different from the TSAR channel identifier and the RSAR channel identifier of Yoon.

In conclusion, the header of Yoon includes payload and channel handle information, while Applicant’s header contains an extension tag and the previously-set internal channel identifier, the extension tag of the Applicant’s invention containing the egress forwarding engine number and the egress channel identifier. Therefore the extension tag and header of Applicant’s invention is unlike the channel handle and header respectively of Yoon.

A fee of \$460.00 is incurred for a two-month extension of time set to expire on December 5, 2007. Applicant's check drawn to the order of Commissioner accompanies this Amendment. Should the check become lost, be deficient in payment, or should other fees be incurred, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in the amount of such fees.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance, and early issuance thereof is solicited. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicants
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56986
Date: 12/3/07
I.D.: REB/ML